

REMARKS

Applicant requests reconsideration and allowance of the present application in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-20, and 22 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 17, and 22 are the independent claims.

No claims have been amended by the present Request.

Claims 1, 3, 5-8, and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,252,835 (Choi et al.). Claims 2, 11-15, 17-20, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Choi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,457,587 (Suzuki et al.). Claims 1-3, 5-8, 10-15, 17-20, and 22 stand alternately rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Choi et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,600,615 (Kiyoura et al.). All rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 11 recite, inter alia, an offset measuring unit which measures one or more offset parameters ... and that that one or more offset parameters correspond to a sum signal....

Independent claims 6 and 10 recite, inter alia, measuring one or more offset parameters ... and that that one or more offset parameters correspond to a sum signal....

Independent claims 17 and 22 recite, inter alia, setting reference offset values for one or more offset parameters by measuring the one or more offset parameters ... and that that one or more offset parameters correspond to a sum signal....

However, Applicant respectfully submits that the cited art, alone or in combination, does not teach or suggest at least the aforementioned features. Thus, without conceding the propriety of the asserted combinations, it is respectfully submitted that the asserted combinations are likewise deficient, even in view of the knowledge of one of ordinary skill in the art.

Choi discusses an arrangement including an RF signal generator 503, an RF amplifier 504, a signal separator 505, a phase comparator 506, and a microcomputer 507. (Choi, Fig. 5). Also, Choi teaches delivering a sum signal from an RF signal generator to an RF amplifier and from the RF amplifier to a digital signal processor. (Choi, FIGS. 3 and 4).

Choi expressly teaches that, in operation, signals from the RF amplifier are provided to the signal separator, signals to measure jitter that are separated by the signal separator are

supplied to the phase comparator, and an error signal f_0 from the phase comparator is provided to the microcomputer. (Choi, Col. 4, lines 20-35).

The Office Action contends that one or more of the offset parameters includes a sum signal. (Office Action, pages 3 and 8). The Office Action also contends that the microcomputer 507 of Choi is the equivalent of both an offset measuring unit and an offset setting unit. (Office Action, page 3). The latter contention is respectfully traversed because the sum signal is not delivered to the microcomputer. Thus, the microcomputer does not measure a sum signal.

As explained above, Choi does not teach delivering the sum signal to the microcomputer (the alleged offset measuring unit). Instead, Choi expressly teaches that the error signal f_0 from the phase comparator is received by the microcomputer. Stated another way, at best, Choi teaches delivering a sum signal to a digital signal processor (see, e.g., Choi, FIG. 3) and to a signal separator (see, e.g., Choi, FIG. 5). And, because Choi teaches that the microcomputer does not receive a sum signal, it is not reasonable to conclude that the offset parameters measured by the microcomputer include a sum signal. Thus, Choi cannot meet the aforementioned features of independent claims 1 and 10.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the rejection of independent claims 11, 17, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Choi in view of Suzuki, the secondary citation to Suzuki relates to a method and system for correcting an offset of a head position signal and is cited for its alleged disclosure of re-measuring newly-measured offset values during a subsequent initial reproduction. Applicant respectfully submits that Suzuki does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Choi. Thus, this combination is deficient.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

Regarding the alternate rejection of independent claims 1, 6, 10, 11, 17, and 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as unpatentable over Choi in view of Kiyoura et al., the secondary citation to Kiyoura et al. relates to a device and method for automatically controlling a servo loop gain and is cited for its alleged disclosure of re-measuring newly-measured offset values during a subsequent initial reproduction. Applicant respectfully submits that Kiyoura et al. does not add anything that would remedy the aforementioned deficiency of Choi. Thus, this combination is deficient.

Accordingly, favorable reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103 are respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the independent claims patentably define the present invention over the citations of record. Further, the dependent claims should also be allowable for the same reasons as their respective base claims and further due to the additional features that they recite. Separate and individual consideration of the dependent claims is respectfully requested.

Lastly, Applicant notes discussions in the Office Action of inherent characteristics or properties related to the claimed sum signals that allegedly based on Applicant's previous remarks traversing rejections under the first and second paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicants do not concede any allegation of inherency based on, or extrapolated from, those remarks, which were solely directed to reasons why rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 112 should be withdrawn

Applicant submits that this Request for Reconsideration After Final Rejection clearly places the subject application in condition for allowance. This Request was not earlier presented because Applicants believed that the prior Amendment placed the subject application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, entry of the instant Request as an earnest attempt to advance prosecution and reduce the number of issues for appeal is requested under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116.

Applicant believes that the present Request is responsive to each of the points raised by the Examiner in the Official Action. However, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to such matters.


There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Request, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: 12-27-06

By: 
Michael E. Kondoudis
Registration No. 42,758

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501